REMARKS

Claim 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-21 are pending. Claim 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 have been rejected. Claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended, and claims 19-21 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-21 remain pending in the present application.

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview held June 24, 2010. The substance of the interview is included in the arguments below.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 11 in this application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that the original or previous claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the original and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The amendments are fully supported by the specification. Claims 1 and 9 recite that the SET CURRENT PACKAGE PATH statement identifies a selected list of a plurality of qualified package collections during runtime, as disclosed throughout the specification, e.g., page 5, lines 15-23; and that the list of qualified package collections specifies a desired search precedence order of the selected package collections in which to search and the package collections are searched in the search precedence order for a package for use with the database statement, as disclosed, for example, on page 5 lines 15-23, page 6 lines 8-18, page 10 line 22 to page 11 line 16, etc. New claim 19 recites creation of a not-found entry, as described, for example, on page 6 line 16 to page 7, line 5. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,235, Bird et al. ("Bird"). Applicant respectfully traverses, and has amended claims 1, 6, and 11 to clarify the invention and to expedite prosecution.

Bird discloses a database management system including a global cache in which packages are cached from catalog tables, and thereafter remain available in the global cache to any other agent requiring them. One or more section entries are associated with a package. Upon receipt of a new request, an agent searches the SQL work area, then the global cache, then the catalog tables for a matching package to the package identified in the request and matching sections to the SQL statement.

In contrast, claim 1 recites providing a SET statement that identifies a selected list of qualified package collections during runtime, the list specifying a desired search precedence order of the selected package collections in which to search. An issued database statement is executed to search the qualified package collections in the search precedence order and locate at least one of the packages for use with the database statement, and the located package is cached for use during execution of one or more other database statements.

Bird does not disclose or suggest providing any statement that identifies or provides a selected list of particular package collections to search during runtime as recited in claim 1. Nor does Bird disclose or suggest providing a statement that specifies a particular search precedence order for package collections and searching in

package collections in that specified order as recited in claim 1. The use of the statement in Applicant's invention allows a specified searching order for a list of multiple package collections to be specified during runtime.

Bird discloses no specified searching order for packages when executing a database statement. Bird discloses caching section entries in an order in which their SQL statements are encountered (col. 5, lines 17-25) and discloses searching for packages and section entries as SQL statements are received and processed (col. 4, lines 56-60; and col. 9, lines 3-12), but no list or order is specified in a provided statement.

Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over Bird. Claims 3-5 and 16 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for additional reasons.

Independent claims 6 and 11 recite similar features to claim 1 and are patentable over Bird for at least similar reasons. Dependent claims 8-10 and 13-15, and 17-18 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims, and for additional reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are patentable over Bird, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 19, 20 and 21 recite that in response to not finding a particular package in an associated one of the package collections during the search of the

package collections, a not-found entry is created in a user database for the not-found package, such that subsequent searches for the not-found package find the not-found entry and skip a loading process for the associated package collection. Bird does not disclose or suggest this feature. For example, Bird in col. 4 lines 60-67 describes that if a package is found invalid in the catalog, it needs to be first marked invalid in the global cache and then flushed from the cache. This is not the same as creating a not-found entry in a user database in response to not finding a package during a package search for statement execution, and in a later search finding that not-found entry later and skipping the collection. Claims 19-21 are therefore believed patentable over Bird for at least the same reasons as their parent claims, and additional reasons.

Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2010

/James R. Riegel/
James R. Riegel
Reg. No. 36,651

Customer Number 45728
(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549